

REMARKS

Please change the previous Attorney Docket No. to the new Attorney Docket No. 2647-03.

The courtesy of the oral interview granted to the inventor and the undersigned on February 28, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged.

During the interview a set of claims was presented to the Examiner, which set is identical to the set of claims contained in this amendment.

The status of the claims that have been presented in this application is as follows.

Claims 1 through 5, 7, 9 through 12 and 14 have been cancelled

Claim 6 has been cancelled and rewritten in independent form as new claim 16.

Claim 8 has been cancelled and rewritten in independent form as new claim 17.

Claims 13 and 15 have been allowed.

Newly presented claims 16 and 17 are claims 6 and 8 rewritten in independent form. The Examiner has indicated that these claims contained allowable subject matter.

Claims 18 through 20 are newly presented and are drawn to a musical string instrument employing Applicant's novel arrangement wherein the second anchor means are secured directly to the soundboard.

Claims 21 through 24 are newly presented and are drawn to Applicant's novel adjustable bridge arrangement for a musical string instrument.

It is believed that there are two separate and distinct inventive concepts disclosed in this application: one to the arrangement whereby the second or lower anchor means are secured directly to the soundboard; and, the second inventive concept pertaining to a

novel adjustable bridge design. Further, it is not believed that the previously presented claims clearly defined this distinction between the two inventive concepts.

A principal reference relied upon by the Examiner has been the Rogers reference in rejection of those claims pertaining to the first inventive concept, *i.e.* those claims directed to an arrangement whereby the second or lower anchor means are secured directly to the soundboard.

At the interview the Applicant pointed out that Applicant's claims were clearly distinguishable from Rogers in that the anchoring means of Rogers are secured to the bridge, not to the soundboard as called for in Applicant's claims. Applicant also left with the Examiner an advertisement of a guitar that showed the commercial version of the subject matter of the Rogers patent that also showed that the anchoring means were secured to the bridge, not the soundboard.

Claims 21-24 directed to the bridge, are believed to be clearly distinguishable over the prior art by calling for – adjustable means for repositioning the bridge body on the soundboard, the adjustable means comprising adjustable fastening means for securing the bridge body against the soundboard whereby the fastening means can be readily loosened and tightened. This is not found or suggested anywhere in the prior art.

At the interview, Applicant was prepared to present to the Examiner evidence of commercial success. The Examiner was also able to view a guitar encompassing the features of Applicant's invention.

Reconsideration, allowance and passage to issuance are respectfully requested.

If there is any matter remaining that can be taken care of by telephone call or further interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey T. Babicz

By


Joseph L. Spiegel

Reg. No. 19,450

Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C.

5 Columbia Circle

Albany, NY 12203

T (845) 452-7840

F (845) 452-4731

e-mail spiegeljoseph@aol.com

Certificate of Express Mailing under 37 C.F.R. 1.10

Express Mail mailing label number EV120875774 US

Date of Deposit May 26 2006

I hereby certify that the above response is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated above addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Joseph L. Spiegel